

1. Written Policies. *AB 2838 enacted more explicit statewide policies to guide LAFCOs. LAFCOs had until January 1, 2002 to adopt written policies and procedures to implement the statutory policies.*

<u>Adopted (or revised) by January 1, 2002</u>	<u>Adopted (or revised) after January 1, 2002</u>	<u>Adopted earlier but not revised</u>	<u>No policies</u>
Butte	Alameda	Alpine	Amador
Fresno	Del Norte	Calaveras	Colusa
Glenn	Lake	Contra Costa	Mariposa
Humboldt	Lassen	El Dorado	Mendocino
Imperial	Modoc	Inyo	
Kern	Nevada	Kings	
Madera	Plumas	Los Angeles	
Marin	San Luis Obispo	Mono	
Merced	Trinity	Monterey	
Napa	Tulare	Orange	
Placer		Sacramento	
Riverside		San Benito	
San Bernardino		San Joaquin	
San Diego		Santa Barbara	
San Francisco		Santa Clara	
San Mateo		Tehama	
Santa Cruz			
Shasta			<u>Did not respond</u>
Solano			Sierra
Sonoma			Siskiyou
Stanislaus			
Sutter			
Tuolumne			
Ventura			
Yuba			
Yolo			

Notes to the Responses to Question 1

LAFCO

Action

Alameda	Adopted 1997, revised May 2002.
Alpine	Remains under old policies.
Amador	Has not met on this subject.
Butte	Adopted 1994, revised after Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act.
Calaveras	Expected to act in August 2002.
Colusa	Pending.
Contra Costa	February 1999.
Del Norte	Partially adopted, will be adopted by September 15.
El Dorado	Adopted in 1980s, revised in 1998-99, revision underway.
Fresno	December 2001.
Glenn	December 2001.
Humboldt	April 2001.
Imperial	January 2001.
Inyo	Adopted earlier but not revised.
Kern	December 2001.
Kings	February 1999.
Lake	March 2002.
Lassen	Adopted in part, remaining by July 15.
Los Angeles	Some policies adopted, others in process of development.
Madera	December 2001.
Marin	October 2001.
Mariposa	Inactive LAFCO; no applications for five years.
Mendocino	Hopefully by the end of 2002.
Merced	June 2001.
Modoc	Adopted in part, remaining by September 2002.
Mono	Adopted 1986, in process of updating.
Monterey	Adopted 1984, revised in 1991 and 1994, currently being revised.
Napa	April, June, August, and October 2001.
Nevada	Adopted 1994, revised in 2002.
Orange	Adopted various policies and procedures before AB 2838.

<u>LAFCO</u>	<u>Action</u>
Placer	February 2001.
Plumas	January 2002.
Riverside	Adopted 1999, revised in 2000-02.
Sacramento	Adopted 1993.
San Benito	Adopted 1995, currently updating.
San Bernardino	December 2000.
San Diego	December 2000.
San Francisco	Adopted 2000.
San Joaquin	Not yet.
San Luis Obispo	Adopted 1985, revised April 2002.
San Mateo	Adopted 1985, revised January and July 2001.
Santa Barbara	Adopted before AB 2838.
Santa Clara	Currently updating existing policies to comply with AB 2838.
Santa Cruz	Adopted 1970, revised March 2001.
Shasta	March 2001.
Sierra	Did not respond
Siskiyou	Did not respond
Solano	December 2001.
Sonoma	May 2001.
Stanislaus	December 2001.
Sutter	December 2001.
Tehama	Adopted 1995.
Trinity	February 2002.
Tulare	February 2002.
Tuolumne	November 2001.
Ventura	Adopted 1963, revised December 2001.
Yolo	Adopted 1963, revised March 2002.
Yuba	March 2002.

2. Special District Representation. *AB 2838 made it easier for special districts to gain LAFCO representation.*

Added special district representatives after January 1, 2000

Monterey
Placer

Did not respond

Sierra
Siskiyou

Special district representatives before January 1, 2000

Alameda
Butte
Calaveras
Contra Costa
El Dorado
Humboldt
Kern
Los Angeles
Marin
Mendocino
Mono
Nevada
Orange
Riverside
Sacramento
San Bernardino
San Diego
San Luis Obispo
San Mateo
Santa Barbara
Santa Cruz
Shasta
Sonoma
Sutter
Trinity
Ventura

No special district representatives

Alpine
Amador
Colusa
Del Norte
Fresno
Glenn
Imperial
Inyo
Kings
Lake
Lassen
Madera
Mariposa
Merced
Modoc
Napa
Plumas
San Benito
San Francisco
San Joaquin
Santa Clara
Solano
Stanislaus
Tehama
Tulare
Tuolumne
Yolo
Yuba

3. Contribution Disclosure. *AB 2838 required LAFCOs to hold a public hearing to discuss the adoption of rules for the disclosure of contributions. LAFCOs with active proposals had until March 31, 2001 to hold a hearing; other LAFCOs had to hold their hearings within 90 days of receiving a proposal.*

<u>Adopted before January 1, 2001</u>	<u>Adopted after January 1, 2001</u>	<u>Did not adopt disclosure rules</u>	<u>Did not respond</u>	
Madera	Butte	Alameda	San Joaquin	Sierra
San Benito	Fresno	Alpine	San Luis Obispo	Siskiyou
San Diego	Humboldt	Amador	San Mateo	
Solano	Imperial	Calaveras	Santa Barbara	
	Inyo	Colusa	Santa Clara	
	Monterey	Contra Costa	Sutter	
	Plumas	Del Norte	Tehama	
	San Francisco	El Dorado	Trinity	
	Santa Cruz	Glenn	Tulare	
	Shasta	Kern	Ventura	
	Sonoma	Kings		
	Stanislaus	Lake		
	Tuolumne	Lassen		
	Yolo	Los Angeles		
	Yuba	Marin		
		Mariposa		
		Mendocino		
		Merced		
		Modoc		
		Merced		
		Napa		
		Nevada		
		Orange		
		Placer		
		Riverside		
		Sacramento		
		San Bernardino		

Notes to the Responses to Question 3

<u>LAFCO</u>	<u>Hearing date</u>	<u>Action</u>
Alameda	March 8, 2001	Existing policies and procedures are consistent with the Act.
Alpine	No proposals	LAFCO is under the county's conflict of interest code.
Amador	No proposals	Disclosures done from existing laws on disclosure.
Butte	February 1, 2001	Adopted rules for disclosing contributions.
Calaveras	July 17, 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Colusa	June 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Contra Costa	January 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Del Norte	April 22, 2002	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
El Dorado	"Spring 2001"	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Fresno	March 2001	Adopted rules for disclosing contributions.
Glenn	December 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Humboldt	January 23, 2001	Adopted rules for disclosing contributions.
Imperial	January 2001	Adopted rules for disclosing contributions.
Inyo	June 25, 2001	Affirmed state requirements for disclosing contributions.
Kern	February 227, 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Kings	April 25, 2001	Not yet.
Lake	March 20, 2002	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Lassen	June 10, 2002	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Los Angeles	May 14, 2001	Rely upon FPPC rules.
Madera	December 5, 2000 & April 10, 2001	Adopted rules for disclosing contributions.
Marin	February 8, 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Mariposa	No proposals	Inactive LAFCO; no proposals for five years.
Mendocino	February 2001	We chose to stay with state standards for contribution disclosure.
Merced	March 22, 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Modoc	June 10, 2002	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Mono	No proposals	Will hold a hearing within 90 days of receiving a proposal.
Monterey	February 26, 2001	Adopted rules for disclosing contributions.
Napa	February 14, 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Nevada	March 15, 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Orange	March 14, 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.

<u>LAFCO</u>	<u>Hearing date</u>	<u>Action</u>
Placer	March 14, 2001	No rules "but simply added language...to the standard preamble agenda."
Plumas	January 28, 2002	Adopted rules for disclosing contributions.
Riverside	March 22, 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Sacramento	February 7, 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
San Benito	October 2000	Adopted the state model conflict of interest code.
San Bernardino	March 21, 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
San Diego	March 5, 2001	Adopted rules on contributions and conflicts of interest in December 2000.
San Francisco	"2001"	Adopted rules for disclosing contributions.
San Joaquin	"None held"	Discussed by commission on March 16, 2001 but did not adopt rules.
San Luis Obispo	January 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
San Mateo	March 21, 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Santa Barbara	"Early 2001"	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Santa Clara	February 14, 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Santa Cruz	March 7, 2001	Adopted rules for disclosing contributions.
Shasta	March 1, 2001	Adopted rules for disclosing contributions.
Sierra	Did not respond	
Siskiyou	Did not respond	
Solano	March 5, 2001 & May 2001	Already had one.
Sonoma	May 2001	Adopted rules for disclosing contributions.
Stanislaus	March 21, 2001	Adopted rules for disclosing contributions.
Sutter	May 24, 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Tehama	Did not hold hearing	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Trinity	March 27, 2001	Commissioners disclose economic interests by filing FPPC Form 700.
Tulare	March 7, 2001	Did not adopt rules for disclosing contributions.
Tuolumne	March 25, 2002	Adopted rules for disclosing contributions.
Ventura	March 21, 2001	Reviewed again in September 2001 but did not adopt rules.
Yolo	March 19, 2001	Adopted rules for disclosing contributions.
Yuba	February 13, 2002	Adopted rules for disclosing contributions.

4. Lobbying Disclosure. *AB 2838 allowed LAFCOs to adopt lobbying disclosure and reporting requirements. LAFCOs with active proposals had until March 31, 2001 to hold a public hearing; other LAFCOs had to hold their hearings within 90 days of receiving a proposal.*

<u>Adopted before January 1, 2001</u>	<u>Adopted after January 1, 2001</u>	<u>Did not adopt lobbying rules</u>	<u>Did not respond</u>
	Fresno	Alameda	Riverside
	Humboldt	Alpine	Sacramento
	Imperial	Amador	San Benito
	Madera	Butte	San Bernardino
	Plumas	Calaveras	San Diego
	San Francisco	Colusa	San Joaquin
	Santa Clara	Contra Costa	San Luis Obispo
	Sonoma	Del Norte	San Mateo
	Stanislaus	El Dorado	Santa Barbara
	Tuolumne	Glenn	Santa Cruz
	Yuba	Inyo	Shasta
		Kern	Solano
		Kings	Sutter
		Lake	Tehama
		Lassen	Trinity
		Los Angeles	Tulare
		Marin	Ventura
		Mariposa	Yolo
		Mendocino	
		Merced	
		Modoc	
		Mono	
		Monterey	
		Napa	
		Nevada	
		Orange	
		Placer	

Notes to the Responses to Question 4

<u>LAFCO</u>	<u>Hearing date</u>	<u>Action</u>
Alameda	March 8, 2001	Existing policies and procedures are consistent with the Act.
Alpine	No hearing	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Amador	No hearing	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Butte	February 1, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Calaveras	July 17, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Colusa	June 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Contra Costa	January 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Del Norte	April 22, 2002	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
El Dorado	“Spring 2001”	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Fresno	March 2001	Adopted rules for lobbying disclosure.
Glenn	December 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Humboldt	January 23, 2001	Adopted rules for lobbying disclosure.
Imperial	January 2001	Adopted rules for lobbying disclosure.
Inyo	February 14, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Kern	February 227, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Kings	April 25, 2001	Not yet.
Lake	March 20, 2002	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Lassen	June 10, 2002	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Los Angeles	May 14, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure
Madera	December 5, 2000 & April 10, 2001	Adopted rules for lobbying disclosure.
Marin	February 8, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Mariposa	No hearing	Inactive LAFCO; no proposals for five years.
Mendocino	February 2001	We chose to stay with state standards.
Merced	March 22, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Modoc	June 10, 2002	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Mono	No proposals, no meeting	Will hold a hearing within 90 days of receiving a proposal.
Monterey	February 26, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Napa	February 14, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Nevada	March 15, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Orange	March 14, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.

<u>LAFCO</u>	<u>Hearing date</u>	<u>Action</u>
Placer	March 14, 2001	No rules “but simply added language...to the standard preamble agenda.”
Plumas	January 28, 2002	Adopted rules for lobbying disclosure.
Riverside	March 22, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Sacramento	March 7, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
San Benito	No hearing	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
San Bernardino	March 21, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
San Diego	March 5, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
San Francisco	“Yes”	Adopted rules for lobbying disclosure
San Joaquin	“None held”	Discussed by commission on March 16, 2001 but did not adopt rules.
San Luis Obispo	January 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
San Mateo	March 21, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Santa Barbara	“Early 2001”	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Santa Clara	February 14, 2001	Adopted rules for lobbying disclosure.
Santa Cruz	March 7, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Shasta	March 1, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Sierra	Did not respond	
Siskiyou	Did not respond	
Solano	March & May 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Sonoma	May 2001	Adopted rules for lobbying disclosure.
Stanislaus	March 21, 2001	Adopted rules for lobbying disclosure.
Sutter	May 24, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Tehama	Did not hold hearing	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Trinity	March 27, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Tulare	March 7, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Tuolumne	March 25, 2002	Adopted rules for lobbying disclosure.
Ventura	March 21, 2001	Reviewed again in September 2001 but did not adopt rules.
Yolo	March 19, 2001	Did not adopt rules for lobbying disclosure.
Yuba	February 13, 2002	Adopted rules for lobbying disclosure.

5. Independent Executive Officer. *Each LAFCO must appoint its own Executive Officer. When did your LAFCO appoint its independent Executive Officer?*

LAFCOs with independent Executive Officers

Amador	(February 2002)	San Luis Obispo	(March 1997)
Butte	(June 2000)	Santa Barbara	(1994)
Contra Costa	(1973)	Santa Clara	(June 2001)
Del Norte	(July 2001)	Santa Cruz	(1973)
El Dorado	(September 1997)	Shasta	(June 2001)
Imperial	(January 2001)	Solano	(May 2000)
Kern	("Before AB 2838")	Sonoma	(January 2001)
Kings	(May 1993)	Stanislaus	(March 2001)
Lake	(November 2001)	Sutter	(March 2001)
Lassen	(July 2001)	Tulare	(1990)
Los Angeles	(1964)	Tuolumne	(January 2001)
Madera	(December 2000)	Ventura	(April 1996)
Marin	(1974)	Yolo	(May 1987)
Merced	(February 2001)	Yuba	(February 2002)
Modoc	(September 2001)		
Mono	(June 2001)		
Monterey	(November 2001)		
Napa	(April 2002)		
Nevada	(September 1980)		
Orange	("Early 1980s")		
Placer	(July 2001)		
Plumas	(July 2001)		
Riverside	(December 1989)		
Sacramento	(June 2001)		
San Bernardino	(January 1981)		
San Diego	("The past 30 years")		
San Francisco	(2000)		
San Joaquin	(July 1977)		

LAFCOs that contract with county for services

Alameda	(July 2001)
Calaveras	(February 2001)
Fresno	(July 2001)
Glenn	(June 2001)
Humboldt	(July 2001)
Inyo	(February 2000)
Mendocino	(September 2001)
Placer	(December 2000)
San Benito	(July 2001)
Tehama	(no date reported)
Trinity	(February 2001)

LAFCOs that have not acted

Alpine
Colusa
Mariposa

Did not respond

Sierra
Siskiyou

6. Independent Legal Counsel. Each LAFCO must appoint its own Legal Counsel. When did your LAFCO appoint its independent Legal Counsel?

LAFCOs with independent Legal Counsels

Amador	(February 2002)	Tulare	(February 2001)
Butte	(October 1991)	Tuolumne	(January 2001)
Contra Costa	(January 2001)	Yuba	(February 2002)
Fresno	(January 2001)		
Kern	("Before AB 2838")		
Lake	(November 2001)		
Lassen	(July 2001)		
Madera	(December 2000)		
Marin	(June 2002)		
Mendocino	(January 2001)		
Merced	(February 2001)		
Mono	(June 2001)		
Napa	(April 2002)		
Nevada	(July 1987)		
Orange	(1996)		
Plumas	(July 2001)		
Riverside	(Unknown)		
Sacramento	(1992)		
San Benito	(July 2001)		
San Bernardino	(September 1985)		
San Francisco	(August 2001)		
Santa Barbara	(2001)		
Santa Clara	(June 2001)		
Shasta	(July 2001)		
Solano	(September 2001)		
Sonoma	(January 2001)		
Stanislaus	(June 2001)		
Sutter	(March 2001)		

LAFCOs that contract with county for services

Alameda	(July 2001)
Calaveras	(February 2001)
Del Norte	(July 2001)
El Dorado	(June 2001)
Humboldt	(July 2001)
Imperial	(January 2001)
Inyo	(June 2001)
Los Angeles	(July 2001)
Modoc	(no date reported)
Monterey	(July 2001)
Placer	(June 2001)
San Diego	(December 2000)
San Luis Obispo	(July 2001)
San Mateo	(July 2001)
Santa Cruz	(no date reported)
Tehama	(no date reported)
Trinity	(February 2001)
Ventura	(July 2001)
Yolo	(January 2001)

LAFCOs that rely on county counsel

Alpine
Colusa
Glenn
Kings
Mariposa
San Joaquin

Did not respond

Sierra
Siskiyou

7. Spheres of Influence. *LAFCOs must update the spheres of influence for all cities and special districts every five years.*

**LAFCOs with
schedules/work plans**

Butte
 Contra Costa
 Fresno
 Humboldt
 Imperial
 Kings
 Lake
 Marin
 Mono
 Monterey
 Napa
 Orange
 Plumas
 Sacramento
 San Bernardino
 San Diego
 San Luis Obispo
 San Mateo
 Santa Cruz
 Tuolumne
 Ventura
 Yolo
 Yuba

**LAFCOs without
schedules/work plans**

Alameda Sutter
 Alpine Tehama
 Amador Trinity
 Calaveras Tulare
 Colusa
 Del Norte
 El Dorado
 Glenn
 Inyo
 Kern
 Lassen
 Los Angeles
 Madera
 Mariposa
 Mendocino
 Merced
 Modoc
 Nevada
 Placer
 Riverside
 San Benito
 San Francisco
 San Joaquin
 Santa Barbara
 Santa Clara
 Shasta
 Solano
 Sonoma
 Stanislaus

Did not respond

Sierra
 Siskiyou

Notes to the Responses to Question 7

<u>LAFCO</u>	<u>Adopted schedule to finish by January 2006</u>	<u>Notes and comments</u>
Alameda	No	No work plan. Budgeted funds.
Alpine	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds. No cities, 3 districts. No changes.
Amador	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Butte	Yes	Adopted work plan August 2002. Small amount budgeted.
Calaveras	No	No work plan. Budgeted funds.
Colusa	No	No work plan. Budget pending.
Contra Costa	Yes	Revised spheres in 1999-00, next review in 2004. No budgeted funds
Del Norte	No	Work plan up for adoption in September 2002. Budgeted funds “in part.”
El Dorado	No	Work plan reviewed but not funded in Spring 2001.
Fresno	Yes	Adopted work plan July 2002. No budgeted funds.
Glenn	No	Work plan discussed in February 2002. No budgeted funds.
Humboldt	Yes	Adopted work plan March 2000. Budgeted funds.
Imperial	Yes	Adopted work plan March 2002. Budgeted “partial” funds.
Inyo	No	No work plan. Budgeted funds.
Kern	No	Work plan “under preparation.” Budgeted “limited” funds.
Kings	Yes	Adopted work plan with the 2001-02 budget. Budgeted funds.
Lake	Yes	Adopted work plan April 2002. Budgeted funds.
Lassen	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Los Angeles	No	Work plan “in process.” No budgeted funds.
Madera	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Marin	Yes	In Strategic Plan but no “specific schedule.” Budgeted funds.
Mariposa	No	Inactive LAFCO; no proposals for five years.
Mendocino	No	“Now setting priorities for beginning the process.” Budgeted funds.
Merced	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Modoc	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Mono	Yes	Adopted work plan August 2002. Budgeted funds.
Monterey	Yes	Adopted work plan May 2002. Budgeted funds.
Napa	Yes	Adopted work plan October 2001. Budgeted funds.
Nevada	No	Work plan proposed for 2002-03 budget.

<u>LAFCO</u>	<u>Adopted schedule to finish by January 2006</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Orange	Yes	Adopted work plan October 1996. Budgeted funds.
Placer	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Plumas	Yes	Adopted work plan May 2002. Budgeted funds.
Riverside	No	No work plan. Budgeted funds.
Sacramento	Yes	Adopted work plan June 2002. Budgeted funds.
San Benito	No	No work plan. "Raised the budget to address" the requirement.
San Bernardino	Yes	Adopted work plan February 2002. Budgeted funds.
San Diego	Yes	Adopted work plan 2001. Budgeted funds.
San Francisco	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
San Joaquin	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
San Luis Obispo	Yes	Adopted work plan January 2002. Budgeted funds for current fiscal year.
San Mateo	Yes	Adopted work plan March 2002. Budgeted funds.
Santa Barbara	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Santa Clara	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Santa Cruz	Yes	Adopted work plan 2001. No budgeted funds.
Shasta	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Sierra	Did not respond	
Siskiyou	Did not respond	
Solano	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Sonoma	No	No work plan. "Allocated some funds" for preliminary work.
Stanislaus	No	Work plan "in progress." Budgeted funds.
Sutter	No	No work plan. Budgeted funds.
Tehama	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Trinity	No	No work plan. Budgeted funds.
Tulare	No	Preparation of sphere work plan is part of 2002-03 work plan.
Tuolumne	Yes	Adopted work plan June 2001. Budgeted funds.
Ventura	Yes	Adopted work plan May 2002. Budgeted funds.
Yolo	No	Work plan up for adoption June 2002. Budgeted funds.
Yuba	Yes	Adopted work plan February 2002. No budgeted funds.

8. Municipal Service Reviews. *To prepare to update those spheres of influence, LAFCOs must conduct service reviews of municipal services.*

LAFCOs that have started municipal service reviews

Butte
 Calaveras
 El Dorado
 Humboldt
 Imperial
 Kern
 Kings
 Lake
 Madera
 Marin
 Mono
 Napa
 Nevada
 Placer
 San Bernardino
 San Diego
 San Joaquin
 San Luis Obispo
 Santa Barbara
 Santa Clara
 Shasta
 Sonoma
 Stanislaus
 Tuolumne
 Yolo

LAFCOs that have not started municipal service reviews

Alameda Trinity
 Alpine Tulare
 Amador Ventura
 Colusa Yuba
 Contra Costa
 Del Norte
 Fresno
 Glenn
 Inyo
 Lassen
 Los Angeles
 Mariposa
 Mendocino
 Merced
 Modoc
 Monterey
 Orange
 Plumas
 Riverside
 Sacramento
 San Benito
 San Francisco
 San Mateo
 Santa Cruz
 Solano
 Sutter
 Tehama

Did not respond

Sierra
 Siskiyou

Notes to the Responses to Question 8

<u>LAFCO</u>	<u>Started reviews</u>	<u>Notes and comments</u>
Alameda	No	No work plan. Budgeted funds.
Alpine	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Amador	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Butte	Yes	Adopted work plan. Budgeted a small amount of funds.
Calaveras	Yes	No work plan. Budgeted funds.
Colusa	No	No work plan. Budget pending.
Contra Costa	No	Adopted work plan for 2004. No budgeted funds
Del Norte	No	Work plan up for adoption in September 2002. Budgeted 5-8%.
El Dorado	Yes	One review underway. No work plan. Partial funding.
Fresno	No	Adopted work plan. No budgeted funds.
Glenn	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Humboldt	Yes	Adopted work plan. Budgeted funds.
Imperial	Yes	Adopted work plan. Contingency fund created.
Inyo	No	No work plan. Budgeted funds.
Kern	Yes	Work plan in preparation. Budgeted “limited” funds.
Kings	Yes	Coordinated with 2003 housing element update. No work plan.
Lake	Yes	Adopted work plan April 2002. Budgeted funds.
Lassen	No	No work plan. Budgeted “approximately 5%.”
Los Angeles	No	Work plan in process. No budgeted funds.
Madera	Yes	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Mariposa	No	Inactive LAFCO; no proposals for five years.
Marin	Yes	Adopted work plan. Budgeted funds.
Mendocino	No	Work plan in process. No budgeted funds.
Merced	No	Work plan in process. Budgeted \$50,000.
Modoc	No	Adopted work plan. Budgeted “approximately 5%.”
Mono	Yes	Work plan in process. Budgeted funds.
Monterey	No	Work starts in July. Adopted work plan. Budgeted funds.
Napa	Yes	Adopted work plan. Budgeted funds.
Nevada	No	Adopted work plan February 2002. Budgeted funds.
Orange	No	Work plan up for adoption in October 2002. Budgeted funds.

<u>LAFCO</u>	<u>Started reviews</u>	<u>Notes and comments</u>
Placer	Yes	Work plan drafted. Budgeted funds.
Plumas	Yes	Adopted work plan. Budgeted funds. Reviews are not really started.
Riverside	No	No work plan. Budgeted funds.
Sacramento	No	Adopted work plan. Budgeted funds.
San Benito	No	No work plan. Budgeted funds. (“We think so.”)
San Bernardino	Yes	Adopted work plan. Budgeted funds.
San Diego	Yes	Working on 50 reviews. Adopted work plan. Budgeted funds.
San Francisco	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
San Joaquin	Yes	No work plan. Budgeted funds.
San Luis Obispo	Yes	Adopted work plan. Budgeted funds for current fiscal year.
San Mateo	No	Adopted work plan. Budgeted funds.
Santa Barbara	Yes	No work plan. Budgeted funds.
Santa Clara	Yes	Adopted work plan April 2002. Budgeted funds.
Santa Cruz	No	Adopted work plan. Preparing RFP. Budgeted funds.
Shasta	Yes	Adopted work plan. Budgeted funds.
Sierra	Did not respond	
Siskiyou	Did not respond	
Solano	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Sonoma	Yes	Work plan up for adoption this summer. Budgeted funds.
Stanislaus	Yes	Work plan in progress. Budgeted funds.
Sutter	No	No work plan. Budgeted funds.
Tehama	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Trinity	No	No work plan. Budgeted funds.
Tulare	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.
Tuolumne	Yes	No work plan. Budgeted funds.
Ventura	No	Adopted work plan. Budgeted funds.
Yolo	Yes	Adopted work plan. Budgeted funds.
Yuba	No	No work plan. No budgeted funds.

9. Sharing LAFCOs' Budgets. AB 2838 required cities and special districts to share with the county government in providing the LAFCO budget. ["N/A" indicates that this question is "not applicable" to that LAFCO.]

LAFCO	Used the statutory formula		<u>Notes and comments</u>
	<u>Cities</u>	<u>Districts</u>	
Alameda	Yes	Yes	
Alpine	N/A	N/A	County pays for LAFCO. No cities. No districts on LAFCO.
Amador	No	N/A	County pays for LAFCO. No districts on LAFCO.
Butte	Yes	Yes	Locally negotiated overall formula: 45% county, 45% cities, 10% districts.
Calaveras	Yes	Yes	Calaveras County has one city that pays 1/3 of LAFCO's budget.
Colusa	No	N/A	County pays for LAFCO. Cities "pending." No districts on LAFCO.
Contra Costa	Yes	Yes	
Del Norte	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
El Dorado	Yes	Yes	
Fresno	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
Glenn	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
Humboldt	Yes	Yes	
Imperial	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
Inyo	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
Kern	Yes	Yes	Special districts voted to switch to "net revenue" basis in 2002.
Kings	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
Lake	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
Lassen	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
Los Angeles	Yes	Yes	
Madera	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
Marin	Yes	Yes	
Mariposa	N/A	N/A	No cities. No districts on LAFCO.
Mendocino	Yes	Yes	Cities couldn't agree to alternatives. Districts couldn't obtain quorum.
Merced	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
Modoc	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
Mono	No	No	Town of Mammoth Lake and Mono County approved alternative formula.
Monterey	Yes	No	Special districts approved alternative formula.
Napa	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.

<u>LAFCO</u>	<u>Cities used the formula</u>	<u>Districts used the formula</u>	<u>Notes and comments</u>
Nevada	Yes	Yes	
Orange	No	No	Cities negotiated an alternative. Districts negotiated an alternative.
Placer	Yes	Yes	
Plumas	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
Riverside	Yes	Yes	
Sacramento	Yes	Yes	
San Benito	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
San Bernardino	Yes	No	
San Diego	No	Yes	Cities negotiated an alternative that left out water and sewer revenues.
San Francisco	No	N/A	City and County of San Francisco pays for LAFCO.
San Joaquin	No	N/A	Cities adopted per capita formula. No districts on LAFCO.
San Luis Obispo	Yes	Yes	County contributed funds for special districts' share in 2001-02.
San Mateo	Yes	Yes	
Santa Barbara	Yes	Yes	
Santa Clara	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
Santa Cruz	Yes	Yes	
Shasta	Yes	Yes	
Sierra			Did not respond.
Siskiyou			Did not respond.
Solano	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
Sonoma	Yes	Yes	
Stanislaus	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
Sutter	Yes	Yes	
Tehama	No	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
Trinity	N/A	No	County pays for LAFCO.
Tulare	No	N/A	Cities adopted per capita formula. No districts on LAFCO.
Tuolumne	Yes	N/A	No cities. No districts on LAFCO.
Ventura	Yes	Yes	
Yolo	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.
Yuba	Yes	N/A	No districts on LAFCO.

10. Processing Fees. *LAFCOs can charge fees to recover their processing costs.*

LAFCOs that charged fees before January 1, 2001

Alameda Plumas
 Amador Riverside
 Butte Sacramento
 Calaveras San Benito
 Colusa San Bernardino
 Contra Costa San Diego
 Del Norte San Joaquin
 El Dorado San Luis Obispo
 Fresno San Mateo
 Glenn Santa Barbara
 Humboldt Santa Clara
 Imperial Santa Cruz
 Inyo Shasta
 Kern Solano
 Kings Sonoma
 Lake Stanislaus
 Lassen Sutter
 Los Angeles Tehama
 Madera Trinity
 Marin Tulare
 Mendocino Tuolumne
 Merced Ventura
 Modoc Yolo
 Mono Yuba
 Monterey
 Napa
 Nevada
 Orange
 Placer

LAFCOs that raised fees after January 1, 2001

Alameda Ventura
 Contra Costa
 Del Norte
 El Dorado
 Inyo
 Kern
 Kings
 Lake
 Lassen
 Madera
 Merced
 Modoc
 Monterey
 Napa
 Nevada
 Placer
 Plumas
 Riverside
 San Bernardino
 San Diego
 San Joaquin
 San Luis Obispo
 San Mateo
 Santa Clara
 Santa Cruz
 Shasta
 Sonoma
 Stanislaus
 Tulare

LAFCOs that don't have fees

Alpine
 Mariposa
 San Francisco

Did not respond

Sierra
 Siskiyou

11. Size of LAFCOs' Budgets. Please compare your LAFCO budget for 2001-02 (the current fiscal year) to the budget for 1999-00 (the fiscal year before AB 2838 took effect). Was your 2001-02 budget higher?

Budget was higher

Alameda San Luis Obispo
 Butte San Mateo
 Calaveras Santa Barbara
 Del Norte Santa Clara
 El Dorado Santa Cruz
 Fresno Shasta
 Imperial Solano
 Inyo Sonoma
 Kern Stanislaus
 Kings Sutter
 Lake Trinity
 Lassen Tulare
 Los Angeles Ventura
 Madera Yolo
 Marin
 Mendocino
 Merced
 Modoc
 Mono
 Monterey
 Napa
 Nevada
 Placer
 Plumas
 Riverside
 Sacramento
 San Benito
 San Diego
 San Joaquin

Budget was about the same

Alpine
 Amador
 Contra Costa
 Glenn
 Humboldt
 Orange
 Tehama
 Yuba

Budget was lower

San Bernardino
 San Francisco
 Tuolumne

No budget

Colusa
 Mariposa

Did not respond

Sierra
 Siskiyou

12. Budget Explanations. *Why you think your 2001-02 budget was higher or lower than in 1999-00?*

<u>LAFCO</u>	<u>Notes and comments</u>
Alameda	The budget was higher primarily as a result of the new law.
Alpine	The budget was the same.
Butte	Moved offices out of the county building. Now must pay for county services. Costs for website.
Calaveras	Many costs previously absorbed by the county. In more accurately accounting for costs, budget increased.
Colusa	No budget in place.
Contra Costa	The budget was the same. LAFCO has tried to maintain, when feasible, a status-quo budget.
Del Norte	Because of the need to move to an independent operation, and to cover increased mandated costs.
El Dorado	Budget increased only for county's direct costs and services. LAFCO cut off stipends and reduced spending.
Fresno	More actual costs.
Glenn	The budget was the same.
Humboldt	The budget was the same. Local agencies agreed to commit resources and personnel to service reviews.
Imperial	Independence and new requirements.
Inyo	The full cost of LAFCO is now charged, plus AB 2838 imposed new mandates.
Kern	Kern County charged LAFCO for costs they absorbed in the past.
Kings	The full cost of LAFCO is now charged, whereas in the past many of the support costs were absorbed.
Lake	Higher costs to meet the statutory requirements of AB 2838.
Lassen	Because of the need to move to an independent operation, and to cover increased mandated costs.
Los Angeles	Higher budget because of work load increases resulting from AB 2838.
Madera	The 1999-00 budget only covered direct costs. In 2001-02 all costs including staff was accounted for.
Marin	(1) Funds for special studies and sphere reviews, (2) Expanded executive officer from part-time to full time.
Mariposa	Inactive LAFCO; no proposals for five years.
Mendocino	AB 2838 imposed more mandates. County used to absorb many costs that were not in the LAFCO budget.
Merced	Costs to prepare policies and procedures, municipal service reviews, and sphere updates every 5 years.
Modoc	Because of the need to move to an independent operation, and to cover increased mandated costs.
Mono	Essentially a status quo budget, reflecting slight increases due to inflation.
Monterey	Costs of new office set-up, full-time staffing, and potential costs of service reviews and sphere updates.
Napa	(1) County departments used to absorb overhead, (2) Staff levels have increased.
Nevada	Increased staffing, additional hours for legal counsel, equipment, training, notice costs, contingencies.
Orange	The budget was the same.
Placer	(1) County used to absorb costs, (2) Expanded work loads, (3) Costs of municipal service reviews.

<u>LAFCO</u>	<u>Notes and comments</u>
Plumas	Higher.
Riverside	(1) Municipal service review requirements, (2) Increased notice requirements, (3) Increased activity.
Sacramento	Requirements of AB 2838. Added staff, consultant costs, and relocation expenses out of county building.
San Benito	There are many more duties and requirements.
San Bernardino	Lower. Reduction in staffing.
San Diego	Service reviews, sphere updates, website upgrades, expanded notices. County used to absorb costs.
San Francisco	Lower. The 1999-00 budget paid for initial costs for consultant and environmental reviews.
San Joaquin	Increase in staff and costs for services and supplies.
San Luis Obispo	To comply with unfunded state-mandates, plus full-time independent staff rather than part-time county staff.
San Mateo	County used to absorb costs. Now the true cost was calculated. Additional funds for consultants.
Santa Barbara	Increased staff support for municipal service reviews plus the county used to absorb costs.
Santa Clara	County used to absorb costs. Equipment costs. New requirements. Additional staff.
Santa Cruz	Due to new mandates: service reviews and sphere updates.
Shasta	Establishment of independent staff/office added one-time costs. Full-time executive officer. Added clerk.
Sierra	Did not respond.
Siskiyou	Did not respond.
Solano	Staffing increases. Hired private legal counsel.
Sonoma	County used to absorb costs. Requirements for sphere updates and service reviews.
Stanislaus	Independent agency, requirements of AB 2838.
Sutter	Costs had historically been absorbed by the county.
Tehama	The budget was the same. Expenditures \$800. Revenues \$2,000.
Trinity	There was less LAFCO activity in 1999-00.
Tulare	Possibility of incurring unforeseen costs associated with the implementation of AB 2838.
Tuolumne	Reduction reflects estimates to comply with AB 2838. Previous budgets didn't track actual time.
Ventura	Hired full-time staff, service reviews, and sphere updates.
Yolo	Added support staff to give analysts more time on studies, service reviews, sphere updates.
Yuba	The budget was the same. Approximately 2 to 4 applications a year. No increase anticipated.